

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-11 remain in this application. Claims 1-11 are rejected. Claims 2 and 3 are cancelled. Claims 1 and 8-11 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objection cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Fig. 4 is objected to for a misspelling of the word "oordinates." The attached drawing sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 4, and corrects the misspelled word to now read "coordinates" in block S6. The applicant elects to delay filing corrected formal drawings until subsequent to the receipt of a Notice of Allowability as per PTOL-37 and CFR §1.85(c).

Claims 1-11 are rejected as obvious over Suzuoki et al. (US 5,537,224) in view of Yasui et al. (US 6,320,580) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Independent claims 1 and 8-11 are amended herein to recite that two-dimensional coordinates of a second texture are calculated by projectively transforming three-dimensional coordinates of vertexes of the polygon on an

imaginary two-dimensional plane, and that the second texture is drawn on the polygon based on two-dimensional coordinates of the second texture calculated by the aforementioned projective transformation.

According to the amended claims, the invention utilizes the following approach: (1) a polygon with a first texture is drawn, (2) the two-dimensional coordinates of the second texture is calculated by projectively transforming three-dimensional coordinates of vertexes of the polygon drawn by the polygon drawing means on an imaginary two-dimensional plane, (3) the second texture is drawn based on the two-dimensional coordinates thus calculated, and (4) moving the second texture on the polygon by varying the two-dimensional coordinates. In such manner, a moving image on the object can be simulated. Since two-dimensional coordinates of the second texture are calculated by projectively transforming three-dimensional coordinates of vertexes of the polygon, each second texture data does not have to include two-dimensional coordinates thereof used for mapping it, and therefore the data amount of each second texture data can be reduced.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of the cited references teaches or suggests calculating the two-dimensional coordinates of the second texture by projectively transforming three-dimensional coordinates of vertexes of the polygon on an imaginary two-dimensional plane, as claimed. Rather, the Suzuoki et al. reference discloses, at column 4, lines 11 to 16, that "the texture data in the texture areas AT1, ... is 2-dimensional mapping transformed" to obtain the two-dimensional coordinate

for the texture. This means that the texture data itself possesses coordinate data, which is to be transformed to the 2-dimensional coordinate data. In stark contrast, the second texture data in accordance with the claimed invention does not have to possess the coordinate data because the two-dimensional coordinate data is calculated from the coordinate data of vertexes of the polygon, by the calculating means (apparatus) or step (method). In this respect, Suzuoki fails to teach or suggest producing the two-dimensional coordinate of the texture data by projectively transforming the three-dimensional coordinates of vertexes of the polygon. Therefore, each of the texture data in Suzuoki must possess the coordinate data, and its data amount becomes large. As described above, in accordance with the present invention as now claimed, the two-dimensional coordinate data of the second texture is calculated from the polygon coordinate data, and hence each texture data does not have to possess the coordinate data.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1 and 4-11 now remaining in the application and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a one (1) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$110 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

James J. Thiel
Reg No. 36,049

enc: Replacement Sheet including Fig. 4